

MAY 07 2007

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Over Provost

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 12, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost and Shepard (US 2004/0157036), hereinafter referred to as Provost. Independent Claims 1, 14, and 15 claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Claim 14 claims the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to said second layer.

Claim 1 and Claims Dependent Thereon

The Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 1 of the present application. The portions of Provost cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. The needle punched web of Provost is comprised of a carrier film 14 and batt 10 of fibers 12. Provost, Paragraph [0093] and Figure 1. In Provost, the batt 10 of fibers 12 is needle punched through the carrier film 14. Figure 2D of Provost shows a final structure of the batt 10 of fibers 12 and their relationship to the carrier film 14. As shown in Fig. 2D of Provost, the fibers 12 form loops protruding through the carrier film 14. Paragraph [0099] of Provost describes the loops as being "a plurality of individual loops 40 extending from a common trunk 42 trapped in film hole 38." Paragraph [0007] of Provost describes the forked needle 34 that creates the hole as having a diameter of 35 gauge or smaller. Thus, the needle 34 has a circular cross section orthogonal to the length of the needle above the forked portion of the needle. Other needle diameters are disclosed in Paragraphs [0038] and [0039] of Provost.

As shown in Fig. 2C of Provost, at one stage in formation of the looped web, the needle penetrates the carrier film 14 such that the entire forked portion of the needle is driven through the carrier film 14. Provost, Paragraph [0097], describes the carrier film

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

14 as having a thickness of about 0.05 mm. Provost, Paragraph [0099] describes the needle as having a total penetration depth "DP" between 2 and 5 mm. Cross sections shown in Figs. 2C and 2D of Provost show that the hole in the carrier film 14 bounds the entire circumference of the needle 34 as the needle is punched through the film carrier. Since the needle 34 has a circular cross section, the hole 38 in the film carrier should also be circular. Thus, each trunk 42 should have a circular cross section as the web material comprising the trunk 42 protrudes through a circular hole 38 (as measured in a plane parallel to the plane of the unaltered web).

The discrete regions (or loops 40) in Provost do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. As discussed above, each trunk 42 has a circular cross section because the web material comprising the trunk protrudes through a circular hole 38. Figures 2D, 3D, 4, 7, 8, and 11 of Provost illustrate the structure of the web in profile. The loops 40 of Provost do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Rather, the loops 40 appear to look like trees or bushes extending from the trunk 42 and are symmetric in the MD-CD plane of the structure in Provost. As shown in Figure 11 of Provost, each set of loops 40 extending from each trunk 42 is spaced apart from the other. Paragraph [0105] of Provost states that "[p]referably there is sufficient distance between adjacent structures so as to enable good penetration of the field of formations by a field of mating male fastener elements." As shown in Figs. 7 and 11 of Provost, each trunk 42 and corresponding loops 40 are spaced apart from other trunks 42 and loops 40. Therefore, loops 40 do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane, as claimed in the present application.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action states that the tufts taught by Provost et al. have fibers aligned in the vertical direction, producing the required linear orientation. Fibers aligned in the vertical direction, as in Provost et al., do not have a distinct linear orientation in the MD-CD plane, as claimed in Claim 1 of the present application. Fibers oriented in the vertical direction are out of plane with the MD-CD plane and cannot be considered to have a distinct linear orientation and longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane, as in Claim 1 of the present application.

The Office Action further states, in regard to Provost, that circular tufts have a distinct length in the longitudinal direction. The tufts in Provost, when viewed from above, would be circular tufts. Circular tufts do not have a distinct linear orientation and

Page 3 of 10

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane, as in Claim 1 of the present application. A circle does not have a distinct linear orientation because all points about the circumference of a circle are equidistant from the center of the circle. There is nothing distinct about any individual points in which all of the points are an equal distance from a single center point. A circle, when viewed from above, has no distinct orientation in any in-plane direction because a circle is symmetric. It is impossible to properly describe a circle as having a distinct linear orientation in the plane of the circle. There is nothing remotely linear about a circle. A circle is round. A circular tuft, as shown in Provost et al., does not anticipate and is outside of the scope of Claim 1 because a circle does not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the plane of the circle.

Furthermore, in the Response to Arguments section, page 7, lines 13-22, the Office Action states that the linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane is provided by multiple tufts in rows in Provost. In Claim 1, each discrete region has a linear orientation defining a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. That is, the linear orientation in the MD-CD plane is provided by the discrete region itself, not a plurality of discrete regions as maintained in the Office Action. Thus, Provost, does not teach a discrete region having a linear orientation defining a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Based on the above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost be withdrawn.

Because Claims 3-5, 8, and 12 depend upon Claim 1, the Applicants submit that Claims 3-5, 8, and 12 are also allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 3-5, 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost be withdrawn.

Claim 14

The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 14 of the present application.

Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer, as in Claim 14.

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Furthermore, Provost discloses a looped fastener product. The looped fastener product of Provost is not a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article as claimed in Claim 14 of the present application.

Finally, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1, Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 15 of the present application.

Provost discloses a looped fastener product. The looped fastener product of Provost is not an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article, as claimed in Claim 15 of the present application.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1, Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Over Sorimachi et al.

Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080). Independent Claims 1, 14, and 15 claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Claim 14 claims the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer.

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Claim 1 and Claims Dependent Thereon

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080). The Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), because Sorimachi et al. does not disclose every element of Claim 1 of the present application. The portions of Sorimachi et al. cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

The discrete regions (protrusions 22a) in Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Sorimachi et al., Column 4, Lines 32-37, states that needles used to create the structure have a diameter. Therefore, the needles in Sorimachi et al. have a circular cross section orthogonal to the length of the needle. As shown in Fig. 3 and described at Column 5, Lines 58-60, of Sorimachi et al., "part of the fibrous web 22 penetrates through the nonwoven fabric sheet 23 and forms protrusions 22a thereon." Since the needles in Sorimachi et al. are circular, the protrusions 22a should have a circular cross section when viewed from the side of the structure presenting the nonwoven fabric sheet 23 to the observer. Figures 3, 4, 6, 7, 8A, and 9A-C illustrate the structure of Sorimachi et al. in profile. The protrusions 22a of Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Rather, each protrusion 22a appears to look like a bump with each bump being symmetric in the MD-CD plane. The cross section illustrated in Fig. 3 (and other figures in Sorimachi et al.) show that each protrusion 22a has the same cross section and the protrusions are spaced apart from one another. Therefore, protrusions 22a in Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

As discussed above, in regard to Provost and the Office Action's Response to Arguments section, the Applicants submit that a circular protrusion does not have a linear orientation defining a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Further, as discussed above, in regard to Provost, fibers oriented in the vertical direction are out of plane with the MD-CD plane and cannot be considered to have a distinct linear orientation and longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane, as in Claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, the Applicants submit that Sorimachi et al. also does not teach a discrete region having a linear orientation defining a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Page 6 of 10

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Because Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13 depend upon Claim 1, the Applicants submit that Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13 are also allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), be withdrawn.

Claim 14

The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Sorimachi et al. does not disclose every element of Claim 14 of the present application.

Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer.

Furthermore, Claim 14 claims a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article. Sorimachi et al. discloses a flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors. The flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors in Sorimachi et al. is not a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article.

Finally, as discussed with respect to Claim 1 above and Sorimachi et al., the portions of Sorimachi et al. cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Sorimachi et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 15 of the present application. Claim 15 claims an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article. Sorimachi et al. discloses a flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors. The flexible

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors in Sorimachi et al. is not an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1 and Sorimachi et al., Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sorimachi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,080) in
View of Kotek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,120,718)

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080) in view of Kotek et al. (US 6,120,718). Claim 11 depends upon Claim 1. As discussed above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable. Therefore, Claim 11 is also allowable. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 11, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Hansson (U.S. Patent No. 6,048,600)

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hansson. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The Office Action indicates that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) but the text is directed towards 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In a phone call on May 4, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the rejection was intended to be under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claims 1, 14, and 15, for two reasons. First, the Office Action fails to identify teaching or suggestion in Hansson of a plurality of fibers having portions reoriented in a direction substantially orthogonal to said MD-CD plane and extending toward the garment facing side of the second layer. In Hansson, the crests 3 extend away from the second layer 5. Second, the text of the Office Action fails to identify any teaching or suggestion in Hansson of the first and second layer being disposed in a face to face relationship to form laminate. In Hansson, the first layer 2 is rippled relative to the second layer 5.

MAY 07 2007

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

In regard to Claim 14, the Applicant further submits that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claim 14 for an additional reason. The Office Action fails to identify teaching or suggestion in Hansson that the first layer is relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer, as in Claim 14 of the present application. The Office Action states that Hansson teaches a hydrophobic first layer but does not identify any teaching or suggestion in regard to the nature of the second layer relative to the first layer.

In regard to Claim 15, the Applicant further submits that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claim 15 for an additional reason. Claim 15 is to an absorbent core. Hansson, is a casing sheet for an absorbent article. Therefore, Hansson does not teach or suggest an absorbent core, as in Claim 15 of the present application.

Claims 3-11 and 13 depend upon Claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claims 3-11 and 13 are also allowable. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections over Hansson be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejections

As stated in the Reply After 1st Office Action filed December 22, 2005, Applicants agree to submit all necessary terminal disclaimers upon indication of allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application and allowance of Claims 1, 3-15 are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 

Signature

Gary J. Foose

Registration No. 58,896
(513) 634-3293

Date: May 7, 2007
Customer No. 27752

(2_21_07_Amendment-Response to Office Action_9456.doc) laf
Revised 04/23/2006